

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 RICHARD ALAN LACY,

4 Plaintiff

Case No. 2:18-cv-00966-GMN-GWF

ORDER

5 v.

6 JAMES DZURENDA et al.,

7 Defendants  
8

9 This action began with a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §  
10 1983 by a former state prisoner. On June 26, 2019, the Court issued an order dismissing  
11 the complaint with leave to amend and directed Plaintiff to file an amended complaint  
12 within 30 days. (ECF No. 4 at 4-5). The 30-day period has now expired, and Plaintiff has  
13 not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

14 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "[i]n the  
15 exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . .  
16 dismissal" of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831  
17 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure  
18 to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.  
19 See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming dismissal for  
20 noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir.  
21 1992) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of  
22 complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal  
23 for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of  
24 address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming  
25 dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421,  
26 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (affirming dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with  
27 local rules).

28 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey

1 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:  
2 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to  
3 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring  
4 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.  
5 See *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at  
6 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

7 Here, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously  
8 resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh in favor of  
9 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of  
10 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay  
11 in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air*  
12 *West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—public policy favoring  
13 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of  
14 dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey  
15 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"  
16 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779  
17 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file an amended complaint within 30  
18 days expressly stated: "It is further ordered that, if Plaintiff chooses not to file an amended  
19 complaint curing the stated deficiencies of the complaint, the Court will dismiss this action  
20 with prejudice." (ECF No. 4 at 5). Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal  
21 would result from his noncompliance with the Court's order to file an amended complaint  
22 within 30 days.

23 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed with prejudice based on  
24 Plaintiff's failure to file an amended complaint in compliance with this Court's June 25,  
25 2019, order.


26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1           It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court shall close the case and enter judgment  
2 accordingly.

3  
4           DATED THIS 31 day of July 2019.

5  
6   
7 \_\_\_\_\_  
8 Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge  
9 United States District Court  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28